

APPLICANT(S): A. RIBAK, et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,972
FILED: October 29, 2003
Page 4

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1 – 36 were pending in the application. Claims 1 – 36 were rejected.

A draft Amendment was faxed June 26, 2008 in preparation for a telephone Interview with the Examiner but was formally entered. In the draft Amendment, claims 16 – 18 and 21 were amended, claims 1 – 14 and 26 – 36 were cancelled from further consideration and new claim 37 was added. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter originally encompassed by claims 1 – 14 and 26 – 36 is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1 – 14 and 26 – 36 were cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the subject matter of claims 15 - 25. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by original claims 1 – 14 and 26 – 36 and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

The present Supplemental Amendment further amends claims 15 – 17, 19 – 24 and 37 after the interview.

The Telephone Interview

Initially, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner, Loren Chauhan, for granting and attending the telephone interview, with Applicants' Representative, Heidi M. Brun, Reg. No. 34,504 on July 1, 2008. In the interview, claims 15 - 17 were discussed, as was the Ruths citation and three new citations (US 2004/0003371 to Coulthard, US 6,199,193 to Oyagi and US 6,513,154 to Porterfield). The Examiner also indicated a possible future rejection of claim

APPLICANT(S): A. RIBAK, et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,972
FILED: October 29, 2003
Page 5

15 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as a single line claim and/or as lacking a concrete and tangible result.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 14 and 26 – 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 “because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.”

Claims 1 – 14 and 26 – 36 have been cancelled without prejudice and accordingly their rejection is now moot.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 2 – 14, 16 – 23 and 27 – 34 “under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention.” Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Claims 2 – 14 and 27 – 34 have been cancelled without prejudice and accordingly their rejection is now moot.

Claims 16 – 17 and 19 - 23 have been amended to conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments bring all of claims 16 – 23 into compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and accordingly request that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 15, 24 and 37 have been amended to recite two steps.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 15, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ruths et al. (*US Patent Publication No. 2003/0018719*, herein "Ruths"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, and 26 have been cancelled without prejudice and accordingly their rejection is now moot.

In order to move the prosecution forward, Applicants will also discuss new claim 37 with respect to Ruths.

Ruths discloses a method and system to provide collaboration between applications such as distance learning, on line gaming, medical imaging, enterprise applications, business to business applications, internet publishing (paragraph 0009), graphical presentation applications, spreadsheet applications, and database applications (Paragraph 0083). These applications are not analogous to an integrated development environment (IDE) because:

- They are end user applications; an IDE is intended for a different market: *developers*, not *users*.
- They are a collection of independent standalone programs; an IDE is an *integrated environment* comprising a number of applications and tools in an integrated suite.

Thus, Ruths does not show "accessing peer support resources ... external to an integrated development environment (IDE) from within said IDE upon instructions from a user of said IDE" as recited in claim 1.

Ruths does not show "wherein said peer support resources are available from a universe of users with a commonality of interest with said user". Ruths does not consider "commonality of interest" but rather, a shared project and provides a platform to edit the collaborative resources (e.g. the shared project).

Accordingly, Applicants assert that Ruths cannot provide the limitations of claims 15 and 37.

Ruths also does not display "topics of discussion based on work being performed in an integrated development environment" (claim 24) as Ruths does not have discussion topics.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that independent claims 15, 24 and 37 are allowable under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 16 – 23 and 25 depend from, directly or indirectly, claims 15 and 24, and therefore include all of the limitations of those claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 16 – 23 and 25 are likewise allowable.

APPLICANT(S): A. RIBAK, et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/695,972
FILED: October 29, 2003
Page 7

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 15 – 25 and similarly allow new claim 37.

With respect to the newly cited citations (US 2004/0003371 to Coulthard et al. (herein "Coulthard"), US 6,199,193 to Oyagi et al. (herein "Oyagi") and US 6,513,154 to Porterfield (here "Porterfield")), Applicants note the following:

Coulthard is also assigned to IBM.

Oyagi provides a user feedback area to a GUI under development and does not have "topics of discussion" (claim 24) or "peer support resources" (claim 15).

Porterfield deals with automating Gantt charts and does not discuss IDEs.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Suzanne Erez/
Suzanne Erez
Reg. No. 46,688
Phone (972)4-8296069

Date: 6 July 2008
IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
P. O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, New York 10598